

New York Tribune.

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Office: 110 N. York, N. Y. Editor: Walter Dill, Secretary and Treasurer: Address: Tribune Building, No. 154 Nassau Street, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.
Daily & Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year \$8.00.
Daily & Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year \$8.00.
Sunday only, 6 months \$1.25; Sunday only, 1 year \$2.00.

FOREIGN RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.
Daily & Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year \$8.00.
Daily & Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year \$8.00.
Sunday only, 6 months \$1.25; Sunday only, 1 year \$2.00.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

Remember the Lusitania!

There was a time in American history when the spectacle of some scores of women and children, American women and children among them, scattered over the seas by a brutal and murderous attack by a warship, their helpless hands outstretched, appealing not to nationality but to humanity, would have moved the Government and the people of the United States to a wrath and indignation which would have stirred the whole nation. In those better and braver days no American could have been brought to believe that in later years, in the presence of such a massacre, an American Administration would wait supine and complaisant, trusting that some technical pretext might absolve it from the duty of protecting American lives or putting a final end to crimes that would make a red Indian blush.

A hundred years ago, when this country was weak and lacking in all that wealth, numbers, national greatness could provide to strengthen its hand, it did not hesitate to venture on a doubtful war to perform the first duty of any State. How would it have seemed to the men of that day if they had been told that a time would come in the history of their country when American women and children would be murdered under the high seas by a friendly nation—God save the mark!—that the massacre would follow a direct and explicit warning by the United States, and four months after the crime there would still be no disavowal, no apology, not even so much as a promise to pay the poor indemnity which is the sole reparation possible.

The men, women and children of the Lusitania were massacred because the German Government believed that the Wilson Administration did not intend to make good its brave words with courageous action. Out of pity for prospective victims the German Embassy in this country warned those who were planning to go down to the sea upon the Lusitania that they would be murdered. They were murdered, and the best that their own country could do for them was to write a note, three notes, magnificent in the lofty humanity therein expressed and futile in effect and in purpose. To these notes Germany made only quibbling answers, letting the last go wholly unheeded and leaving the United States to mourn its murdered dead without hope of reparation.

To-day, after the Ancona killing, as yesterday, and all days since the submarine blockade began, the American Government is sitting calmly in the face of all the evidence that is mounting of a hideous crime, for which no technical defence is a defence, eagerly, hopefully, watchfully waiting for some pretext, detail, surface circumstance which may excuse it from taking any action. It is thinking not about the dead, the slaughtered women and children, not about the future perils and possibilities for American women and children; it is thinking of the best way to escape from the situation which only courage could face and only deep and sincere patriotism meet.

Across the water men, even women and children, are giving their lives for the things that are worth living and dying for. They are making the supreme sacrifice out of which arises national and human greatness. Here in America, under the inspiration of Mr. Wilson's Administration, the American people are day by day absorbing more and more of the cult of cowardice and the gospel of selfishness. It is better that some women and children should be murdered than that many men should risk their precious lives. It is better that American honor, all that America has meant in the years of our national existence, should be discarded than that this country should put to the touch its comfort, its prosperity, its glorious peace, which is the peace of cowardice. This is the New Patriotism.

More than all this, from day to day there is growing up the belief that there is something of super-nobility in this American attitude, that there is something of higher morality, more perfect religion in suffering murder, refusing to protect your women and children, in being comfortable rather than brave, and secure rather than self-sacrificing, just so long as it is possible to find appropriate words and pretty phrases, just so long as it is possible to declare an abstract devotion to high principles without taking a single step to defend or maintain these principles. This is becoming the American doctrine of public and international policy.

Unhappily there is only one result to such a policy. It does not invite respect, but murder; it does not make us respected, it does not even keep us safe. To-day our own country is filled from one end to the other with disorder and with violence, which shows itself in fires, explosions, plottings. Ships that sail from American ports break into flame. An Austrian Ambassador in this country becomes the captain of a band of ruffians, and when sent home

receives a decoration from his government as the reward of his infamy. Alien fringes of our population are making alien interests the test of their votes cast in our elections and openly boasting of it.

Abroad American citizens have been killed in Mexico with an impunity that staggers belief. On the high seas we have had murder after murder, and each murder has only provoked further literary experiments and excursions. At this present hour no one sees the helpless women and children sinking in the Mediterranean, victims of a fury and madness beyond belief; all that millions of Americans are thinking of, so the Washington dispatches would indicate, is some pretext that will save a reluctant Administration the difficulty of defending, not the lives of Americans but the abstract principle that murder is, if not a crime, at least "an unfriendly act."

Let us take full measure of the estate to which we have come. Let us realize that this estate was bound to be reached when we consented to suffer the murder of the women and the children of the Lusitania to go unatoned, even by the miserable fiction of a disavowal and apology. There never was any reason after that why any nation should have the smallest hesitation in murdering Americans. This the Germans continued to do in the Channel and the Atlantic until British fleets had reduced the number and restricted the area of operations of German submarines. Only when the submarine campaign in the north had collapsed did the Germans fling us a surly and grudging pledge to quit massacre as an occupation.

Now, when they have found another open sea, in which it may take more months before their submarines can be disposed of, they and the Austrians are setting forth on a new campaign of slaughter, and American lives are once more the first sacrifice. But there is no reason to emphasize the American lives; Mr. Wilson's admirers would have us believe that our Government has become the champion of neutral rights and neutral lives the world over. It has, in words, and the Germans have answered the words by a deed which will remain memorable in the assembled records of human brutality and shame.

The women and children of the Ancona have perished as did those of the Lusitania. They have perished because their murderers were satisfied that no American act would follow such a crime. They have perished because Berlin and Vienna rightly believe that in America "safety first" is the motto of the Administration and of the people, whom the Administration represents. Berlin and Vienna believe that Mr. Wilson and his advisers will see, not the unfortunate human beings helpless and defenceless tossed into the sea, but some technical excuse by which they can escape the responsibility of honor and humanity which rests upon the nations whose citizens are thus destroyed.

We have come a long way since the morning of the Lusitania stirred our moral indignation and universal horror. By degrees we have grown callous to all the appeals of human sympathy and human emotion. "Safety first" has become the watchword of the sons and grandsons of those who through four long years gave their lives that the conception of America which came to them from their fathers should be transmitted unscathed and unstained. Fifty years ago men died without hesitation that the things that were more than life might live. To-day we are taught and our Government is conducted on the idea that to escape all danger and avoid all sacrifice is the noblest possibility in life or citizenship, that life itself is everything, and what one makes of life is nothing.

So far we have come. Let us not mistake the fact or the cause. Is it not possible that some day those who are responsible for this betrayal of America, the true America, may be overwhelmed by an uprising that will find its inspiration in the words, "Remember the Lusitania?"

An Englishwoman's Protest.

Mrs. Pankhurst's protest against what she calls the obstinacy of British Ministers seems a trifle overwrought. She says they must have something of "a German strain" in them to be so stubborn, yet in the same breath she holds up the German government as an example, complaining that whereas it employs half a million women, no more than a tenth of that number are at work in the English factories or other places where their services might be of inestimable value.

It is true that so far only a comparatively small proportion of the women who offered themselves have been chosen. But something has already been done to meet the demand expressed in the great parade of "the women of England." A committee was appointed to consider the question of the employment and remuneration of women, and as a result an elaborate set of regulations was drawn up with a view to giving them work not commonly recognized as women's work in the munition factories.

The probability is that for the present, at least, skilled hands are badly needed, and naturally men accustomed to the work are chosen in preference to women who have to go through a period of apprenticeship. There is reason to believe that by now the munition factories in Great Britain are pretty well organized, but until quite recently the most urgent problem was to man and equip them thoroughly, and until they were running smoothly it was hardly to be expected that the claims of the women would be considered. If those who are clamoring for compulsory national service have their way the turn of the women will surely come.

It must be a little disconcerting, however, for Mrs. Pankhurst to be confronted with a resolution of the members of the Women's Social and Political Union, protesting on the ground that the union's name and platform are "no longer used

for women's suffrage, or to remedy the innumerable disabilities of unfranchised womanhood, but for other purposes outside the scope of the union." With dissension of this sort at home, it seems invidious to find fault with ministers for "spending too much of their time fighting among themselves."

Some Good Out of Evil.

Following the Williamsburg factory fire, which cost twelve lives, it is reported that there has been a rush of property-owners to comply with orders for improvements issued by the Fire Prevention Bureau. There is hope in that, even if it be pitifully like locking the door after the horse is stolen.

There is just one real reason why the work of the Fire Prevention Bureau and the State Industrial Commission falls short—the greed of property owners who place their money above the lives of their employees or tenants. If the horrors of that funeral pyre for twelve men and women have shamed owners out of their miserable money worship, the deaths will have been of some service to the living. They remain, nevertheless, a frightful indictment of the human nature which rates money so high and human life so low.

His Knitting.

To the insistent anti-feminist complaint that woman is invading man's industrial sphere there is a very adequate retort, but one which for some reason is not frequently employed, to wit, that man has been and is invading woman's sphere. The world is well stocked with male cooks, for example, and with male dishwashers. And what a lot of men there are who sew and who nurse invalids. One hesitates to speak of waiters, too, in this category, but at the least their occupation lies on the border line. Their numbers would surely swell this male invasion to proportions not incomparable with those of the feminine offensive, especially if taken the world over. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, and why not the other way about?

All of which has a bearing on the avocation of Mr. Thaddeus P. Giddings, supervisor of music in the public schools of Minneapolis and instructor at the State University of Minnesota. Mr. Giddings knits mittens for newsboys in his off moments, and has become so proficient with the needles that he can complete twenty-four pairs of mittens a month. The amiable vice even grows upon him, he finds, so that he would gladly knit in the streets and while waiting for food in restaurants but for the prospective ridicule. In other words, Mr. Giddings, in blazing a new trail, somewhat timidly, perhaps, directly to the heart of woman's industrial stronghold, is simply following a precedent established by his own sex back somewhere in the mists of history.

This should be a source of cheer to anti-feminists, and no doubt it would be if the feminists would only complain in their turn. But their complaisance provokes the suspicion that the "masterful" sex is getting a little the worst of the exchange, that its counter-offensive is leading it into comparatively barren territory of little strategic importance. Well, who knows? Some day the cook may be considered greater than the captain of industry, the waiter than the warrior (depending upon his watchfulness), and knitting become a Presidential requirement. Then whose triumph?

Social Customs of the Crow Indians.

The Crow Indians are divided into thirteen clans; in former times the number was probably greater. These groups are called by nicknames like designations such as Whistling waters, They bring game without having killed it, Kicked-in-their-stomachs, and so forth. Every individual belongs to his mother's clan, and it is considered highly improper to marry a person of one's own clan, since all the married women of that group are reckoned as belonging to the status of either a mother or a sister. Those individuals whose fathers belong to the same clan stand to each other in a very special relation, which for want of a better name may be called the "joking relationship." They are privileged to play pranks and practical jokes on each other without giving offence. More particularly it is the function of one of them to administer a stinging rebuke of tribal morality or etiquette. In such a case the "joker" will hide his face until some public occasion arises. Then he will boldly come forward and twist the culprit with his deed in the face of the assembled throng, and to his utter discomfiture. Against this punishment there is no redress, for nothing said by a joking relative can be resented. The only thing a man can do is to wait for an offence on the part of his denouncer and then treat him to a dose of his own medicine. Another social custom of the Crow, which is often encountered among Indian tribes, and also among the natives of Australia and Africa, is the mother-in-law taboo. A man and his wife's mother never talk with each other, not for any motives of hostility but rather as a token of mutual respect.

Britain's Maori Fighters.

The second contingent of Maori recruits is now being sent to France, where they will be sent to the front at Fort Takanu, Auckland. They already number about 400. They are a muscular set of fellows, judging from photos of them doing physical exercises on the beach, and they take to the military life with the enthusiasm of a race of fighters. Everything has been done in the choice of site and in the arrangements of the camp to promote the good health of the dusky warriors, acting on experience bought rather dear in some preventable sickness in a white camp. One Maori, however, suggests that their contingent would be even healthier if they might gradually more nearly approximate to the state of nature of their ancestors. There would certainly be much less trouble caused by wet uniforms and boots. The Maoris were never troubled with cold until they became civilized enough to want blankets and to wear clothes. In the old days a Maori wore his flax cloak when he went out into the wet, and took it off when he returned home. His wet skin, from head to foot, dried easily, and there was, none the worse, and with only one garment to dry. But the disadvantage of "natural habitation" (as the dark defenders of our Empire would be found when stripes and medals had to be affixed and other conventions of the parade ground observed.

ITALY'S PATRIOTISM EXPLAINED.

By One Who Thinks His Countrymen in America Deceived.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: It has been a source of wonder to me to see that a large number of Italians are leaving free and pacific America to come to Italy in order to serve in the army. I know that the Italian emigrants have an exaggerated attachment to their not very comfortable hearth; but I did not think that such attachment was so strong as to induce them to sacrifice their life on the battlefield. Wishing to fathom this mystery, I set about to interrogate quite a few of these reverts, and learned that it is not patriotism that drives them hither (at least the greater number of them) but the belief, deeply rooted in their mind, that they must obey the orders of the King of Italy, as given by his sundry consuls in the United States.

All the reservists with whom I spoke were firmly convinced that the Italian Consuls are invested with authority to arrest those Italians that refuse to answer their calling, and that the United States government will force them to return to Italy and fight.

This fallacious idea is also entertained by Italians who are American citizens, either by the acquisition of the full citizenship papers or by the naturalization of their parents; and by those that had declared their intention to become American citizens.

I tried to explain to the reservists of this latter class that they were exempt from military service. It is true that the Italian Civil Code expressly states that Italians who have become alien citizens and their male children must serve in the army; but the Italian government issued a decree a few months ago, specifically exempting Italians who become citizens of the United States, as well as their children, from military service. This decree was issued in consequence of a protest lodged by our government with the Italian government, in connection with the arbitrary impressing into the Italian army of a young American citizen of Italian extraction, named Da Prato.

As regards those Italian reservists who still retain their Italian citizenship, their response to the calling of the King of Italy is purely voluntary. They cannot be forced to leave civilized America to fight in Italy, and the United States will surely not in any way molest them if they desire to ignore such calling.

But my arguments proved quite fruitless. For the simple reason that the average Italian immigrant clings to his ideas—especially if they be wrong ideas—with a tenacity worthy of a better cause. Of course, Italian officials cleverly exploit this ignorance of Italian immigrants. I have had occasion to touch on the subject with various officers. They maintained that the United States government was bound by treaty with Italy to compel Italians residing in the United States to join the Italian army, which is utter rot.

I believe that the American press should feel it incumbent upon itself to enlighten those unfortunates who are apt to be called to the colors on the real status of things. I am certain that if they were convinced of the fact that their return to Italy cannot be made compulsory very, very few of them would come here.

In preventing these unfortunate Italians—and other Europeans, for that matter—from being used as "fodder for the cannons" that serve to fight the battles of the hopelessly cruel and unenviable ruling classes of Europe not only would be performing a great act of humanity, but we would likewise be fostering our own welfare. For these reservists are all men in the prime of life, whose vigor and capacity for work should be put for constructive, not destructive, purposes.

Therefore, why permit that they be slaughtered on Europe's battlefields? Let them stay in America, where they can help advance a nobler form of civilization by building railroads, aqueducts, subways, etc. America needs this kind of proletariat, and will need it still more in the future.

Naples, Oct. 20, 1915. W. C. B.

American Sentiment Still Pro-Ally.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: In your editorial of November 10 you say that the majority of Americans do not agree with The Tribune's view, viz.: "That Germany is necessary if American democracy is to live and perform its service," and you therefore warn Great Britain not to rely upon the people or the government of the United States for sympathy or support. I have been in perfect sympathy with The Tribune in its ably written editorials on the war, but in this instance I must take exception. In my rather limited field of observation, I do not find many intelligent people who do not believe that the defeat of Germany is necessary, not only for the good of this nation, but of the whole civilized world. Also let me differ with you in that I do not believe that the views of the majority are reflected in Washington.

It is not the ignorant or illiterate whose influence shapes the destinies of nations. It is the intelligent and thoughtful element—the majority of which we have to reckon with. How many of the people of Germany, France or the other belligerent nations have any influence on the issues of the present war? Of course, in forming our conclusions, we eliminate the German-American population. And why, as you contend, should public opinion differ beyond the Alleghenies? Does not the same electrical current carry the same news to those Western states? Six thousand miles is no more than three thousand in the transmission of news. It is not that if a vote could be taken in this country, two-thirds of the people would be favorable to the Allies primarily, because they believe Germany guilty of forcing this war upon the world, and, secondly, because they believe the best interests of humanity depend upon German defeat.

We do not expect the officials at Washington to grant any special consideration to either of the warring nations, as their duty is to maintain strict neutrality, but at the same time to uphold the rights of this nation, instead of following the vacillating course which they have pursued. Oh, for a little decision at the seat of government which would not invite war, but would stand for justice and uphold the dignity and prestige of this great nation!

O. W. BENNETT.
Middletown, Conn., Nov. 10, 1915.

Negligence the Trouble.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Since the Triangle fire the Fire Department has done little toward the safety of shops where the exits are bad. It seems to me that the Commissioner, Robert Adamson, is not successful in enforcing this law. Mr. Adamson declared that the situation could not be changed within the next ten years. This is not so. If his inadequate staff could only be broken and good, reliable men put in their places there would be a marked difference within the next year. The laws are not defective. No; there is only one fault which we could attribute to that, and that is negligence.

I suggest that the Commissioner have all hazardous shops in our city practise a fire drill at least once a week. These drills would in time teach the people not to be so care excited (in case of danger) and, of course, would also train them to march down into the street quietly.

CHARLES HYMAN.
Brooklyn, Nov. 9, 1915.

THE NEW ARLINGTON.



"WHERE THE BRITISH GO WRONG"

Approval and Disapproval of The Tribune's Plain Spoken Statement of the Present Attitude of the Majority of Americans, with Some Animadversions on the State of the Country, Present and Future.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The forcible leader in The Tribune to-day is a bold declaration and one that many native Americans will be compelled with shame to acknowledge as a clear and sound indictment: "Let us be perfectly frank in this matter; the vast majority of Americans have no appreciation of the meaning of the present conflict in history." Great has been the fall from the "ideals of the fathers," emphasized by Alexis de Toqueville in the "thirties" of the century that is past, compared with the ethical standards of the electorate of the present time.

Yes, let us be very frank and confess that the mediocrity of our democracy is becoming more and more evident. The smatterers are predominant in greater proportion than in the days of old. Superficially abundant in schools, colleges, and the press, too, in larger measure than ever before. Pessimism is the chord of discordance and is to be observed almost everywhere throughout the land. What is the nature, for example, of the understanding the average inhabitant of the community enjoys in respect to political principles and the ideals which founded this Republic?

The conditions in New York extend to the country at large, though possibly in less degree. As a personal observer in Europe and the South American republics of social and political conditions, I am urged to acknowledge that the intellectual development of the democratic ideal and the perpetuation of republican forms in government throughout the world rest largely upon the mastery skill of the great French democracy. France is fighting not alone for herself. The republics of the Western Hemisphere are profoundly concerned in the guarantee of the continuation of democratic power. France is helping to establish republican control of the German Empire by the people of Germany. France is awakening again in this commonwealth the spirit of 1776.

Our Civil War did not contain elements of dissolution as powerful as those at work here in the past decade. As a nation we have been indifferent to the writing on the wall, and have permitted ourselves to drift into a maelstrom of sordid commercialism, which is as treacherous to a continuation of the socialism of Christianity as is the absolutism of the Prussian dynasty.

Yes, let us be frank with one another and impress strongly the truth on France and Great Britain that the "vast majority" of the children of the fathers of '60-'65 are not informed in respect to the objects to be achieved through the attainment of that standard of political enfranchisement which establishes freedom and not vassalage. Yes, let us say to the nations abroad, it is true that we have read and studied certain books when we attended school, and we answered certain questions, and then we received a parchment or a scrap of paper, and some of us do not know what became of it. We do not understand and don't care about democratic ideals unless there is "something in it for us." Yes, we shall admit publicly on one or two occasions essential as a matter of self-respect to apologize for being a native of my own country.

As for our administrators at Washington: God save the mark! They had the opportunity a year ago last August to vibrate "the ideals of our fathers" as so to be heard in every state in Eastern Europe and by the nations of Asia as clearly as at Bunker Hill. Had the trumpet then been sounded it would have emphasized again to the countries in the south that it is the firm intention of the people in this Republic to have the autonomy of the smaller states respected and sustained as sacred, and that the tearing of a treaty does not annul the great obligation to protect human liberty and to co-operate in the emancipation of the world. Again and again the Executive had the chance which he could not see—the day of special prayer, then came Thanksgiving Day and the Christmas holidays, with Washington and Lincoln's birthdays in the new year. The Day of Independence finally came; still he failed in the manly courage to declare for

the principles of democracy which wrote the Constitution. So it has been, to wait and think and think and wait, to determine if it is right to demand the disavowment of a hideous crime such as the sinking of the Lusitania.

Yes, let us publish to the world statistics revealing the astounding truth that in criminal instinct this Republic of ours seems to be in the van and that the metropolitan city surpasses in homicides and suicides and crime in general the cities of London, Paris, Berlin and Vienna together, and that the civil power is partially lost in the central power of the state. Yes, let us confess and proclaim aloud, and it is said in full solemnity, that "the vast majority of Americans have no appreciation of the meaning of the present conflict in human history," and let us emphasize the disgrace by acknowledging that we have in this Republic, in the second decade of the twentieth century and the 138th year of the Declaration, a slighter sense of morality and duty than prevailed in the middle of last century.

The days of the telephone and the wireless and mechanical flight stand only for the "dollar." We have 15,000 public and private high and normal schools and more than 1,200 universities, colleges and professional institutions, and a newspaper press in nearly every settlement or county in the commonwealth. In view, therefore, of the conditions which we know to exist, how can it be else than true that for France and Britain "to reckon on American complaisance is to make a profound blunder which will lead to others?"

The days of the Federal Republic are numbered unless the people return to the spirit of Washington, and this spirit does not necessarily mean the firing of a single shot other than that bolt in the form of a proclamation from the Chief of the Nation that this Republic is a democracy of the people, by the people, for the people, and that the fundamental principles of democracy must be accepted by all nations if Christian civilization is to endure. Has he the real manhood to make the declaration, or are we again to founder in the mush of rhetoric?

RICHARD COLLIER.
New York, Nov. 10, 1915.

American Intelligence Indicted.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In your editorial of this morning "Where the British Go Wrong" you have laid great stress on a statement you have made, reading as follows: "The vast majority of Americans have no appreciation of the meaning of the present conflict." Now, the meaning of this present conflict in the minds of a vast majority of the intelligent people of this country is whether militarism shall succeed in establishing itself as the predominating policy of the world of nations, or whether the spirit of democracy shall prevail in governments and peoples. I can hardly think that you would seriously contend against this proposition. If your statement quoted above were true it would be as lamentable an indictment as could be brought against the intelligence of a great nation, for it is so patent to an unprejudiced mind that this is the issue involved in the fearful war now on in Europe that he who runs may read. The government of our country is, of course, neutral, and so far as your argument is based on this fact you are justified in giving it all the value that such a basis will bear. But as far as the great prevailing sentiment of the intelligence of the people is concerned I cannot see how you are justified in making the sweeping statement quoted.

S. H. T.
New York, Nov. 10, 1915.

An Accurate Analysis.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Refreshing, accurate to the very life, is the leading editorial of to-day's Tribune. A clear analysis, properly proportioning the various elements in the make-up of our nation and which conclusively places before the world our present status. With such articles The Tribune comes into its own and easily assumes the leading place in our country's advanced journalism. Comment from all quarters of the globe will greet you on this issue and commendation at home, in which is pleased to join A CONSTANT READER.
New York, Nov. 10, 1915.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The urge to express a humble yet sincere appreciation of your honorable attitude toward the real issues of humanity as no longer be withheld. You have stood for the proposition that a neutrality which is come wise between right and wrong is not a more wantonly wicked than any physical offense. Claims to any sort of moral sense cannot be predicated upon "expedients," "prosperity" or "general welfare."

It is difficult to conceive of a standard for a nation or community which would be intolerable in the conduct of the individual. The subject of our country's moral obligation has been very ably discussed in your columns, and I am optimistic enough to believe that trait does not outweigh honor in the hearts of the common people. Unfortunately, a minority expression can create a lot of trouble, and the latest "triumph" of the State Department bears an exceedingly sinister resemblance to political high-explosive. Future generations are certain to blush for the deadly silence after Belgium's ravishment. What may be the sentiments regarding a protest for the sake of a few miserableness? I dare say the history of this century does not hold the undivided interest of those who have a part in the present life.

Incidentally, and because I have seen to reference to the matter, I would suggest that as a matter of fact "Lloyds" has a fairly accurate knowledge of the ownership, when it comes to every seaworthy craft, and it is quite possible that such vessels and cargoes as furnish the present basis of protest may be easily identified if the administration came to deal fairly and risk the jeopardized reputation vote. In conclusion, I am not an Anglophobe, but the fifth direct descendant of a Scotchman who gave his life and property to this nation in 1776, and every succeeding generation has furnished volunteers. I must stand opposed to the principle that there is a middle ground between right and wrong. Expediency is more detestable than expediency when it is based upon profitable expectations.

New York, Nov. 11, 1915. J. G. P.

America Unneutral.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The American people are not neutral. We are, as a whole, pro-Ally. Some of our young men are serving in the British and French armies; many are working in French hospitals or driving motor-ambulances in Flanders; a number are in Belgium under the American Commission for Relief. We have contributed fairly well to funds for the wounded and destitute, taking care, usually, to provide that neither money nor other supplies should go to Germany. We are not neutral, and we are asking ourselves why our government should think it necessary to treat the Allies as if they were on the same level as Germany.

The American people have not overlooked or forgotten Germany's crimes, although our government appears to have done so. No Americans out of ten have made up their minds that Germany is the guilty party in this war, guilty of having planned and begun it and of having waged it in a barbarous manner. Our sympathies are with the Allies, and if we cannot fight side by side with them we wish to help them in all we can. We are confident that they will win, and we believe that every hindrance thrown in their way will only prolong the war.

Therefore we do not ask that our government shall be impartial. We regret that our State Department should stand upon strict legality and nag Great Britain about the blockade. We are glad there is a blockade, and as for Britain, we say "Strength to her arm!"

GEORGE McLEAN HARTER.
Princeton, N. J., Nov. 8, 1915.

American Position Well Stated.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: If you reprint in any more permanent form or collection the admirable article in this morning's Tribune on the British blockade, please let me know. I bought up all copies I could lay my hands on to send to my friends abroad. No better statement of our position has appeared anywhere.

C. C. CLARE.
New Haven, Conn., Nov. 10, 1915.